





AN  
EPISTLE  
TO THE  
READER.

Reader,

**I**T is none of the *business* of this Epistle, to beg thy favourable and indulgent Respects for the Author and his Work; which is almost as beggarly as begging the Question: But least of all to crave that thou wouldest not be so suspicious and severe, as not to take all Citations by which I represent my Author upon my own word, without giving thy self the Trouble, and me the sad Apprehensions of a diligent Scrutineer that will see with his own Eyes

I am not much in love with Apologies in Epistles to the Reader: But if I must in civility treat thee a little that way, it shall be only to tell thee, that if I could have found any particular faults in the following Tract deserving thy Censure before their Printing off; thou shouldest not have found them there. And that I suppose thou wilt read me as a man liable to Mistakes and Passions, of which thy

self art not altogether incapable ; and yet neither nthee  
nor me to be justified.

As to the Reverend and Learned Author with whom I  
have here to do, and for whom I have a Veneration for his  
real worth, and many of his Works sake : I doubt not but  
he knows how to put a difference betwixt the Liberty of the  
Pulpit and the Press ; and the Countenance of a Comple-  
ment, and a Controversy. If this have somewhat in the  
manner that is almost necessary to ease my weariness in  
writing, and thine in reading it, and I do a little indul-  
gere genio, pardon me this wrong.

I intended to have joyned with this Tract, my thoughts  
of Mr. Baxters Notions of a Parochial Assembly, being  
a particular Church organical of Divine Institution, inde-  
pendant on the Diocesan ; and as such to be Communicated  
with. But this I have reserved for a Tract by it self,  
and 'til I have seen Mr. Baxters Answer (which I hear is  
in the Press ) to a Book intituled, Mr. Baxters Judg-  
ment and Reasons, &c. which hath matter in it worthy  
perusal, relating to the same Argument.

---

ERRATA. Page 9. l. 25. read in the Pew. p. 9. l. 36. read may  
go to. p. 17. l. 8. read may not be said. p. 31 & 32. for 5th  
dispute, read 5 Disputations.



---

AN  
ANSVVER  
TO  
Mr. Baxters Book,

INTITULED,  
*Catholick Communion doubly Defended, by  
Dr. Owens Vindicator, and Richard  
Baxter.*

---

SECT. I.

*No Consent of Dr. Owens Vindicator to the Catholick  
Communion defended by Mr. Baxter.*

Reverend Sir,

**I** Having read your answer to a Book, Intituled, *AVINDI-  
CATION* of the late Dr. Owen, &c. though I am not  
over strongly addicted to the *Scribling* Humour; yet ( Con-  
sidering all Circumstances according to my small Prudentials)  
I was determin'd ( after some Hesitations ) to a publick reply.  
And some Passages in your Answer, look as if you expected it.

The Title of your book in the *Frontispiece*, Scil. *CATHO-*

B

LICK

*LICK COMMUNION DOUBLY DEFENDED, BY DR. OWENS VINDICATOR, AND RICHARD BAXTER*: has so much of *Riddle* in it, that, I confess, I am not the *Oedipus* who can reconcile it: Nor did that manner of *sign* at the door, direct me to look for an *Answer* (much less a *controversial Answer*) to my Vindication, as the Entertainment *within*. But however *Singular* you have been in mis-matching the *style*, and the *Book*; Mr. *Baxter*, and Dr. *Owens Vindicator* as co-authors: I shall digest them as they come to hand, as well as I can. And in the mean time, You might hold me excused, if I should in my Title have followed so great an Example; only that it be with somewhat more of Congruity. But I am not disposed to make my Reader gaze at such an unusual Spectacle.

I have Sir, no light *Quibbling* Design in this Reply, nor to put *Tricks* upon a Person I so much Reverence, and in a cause so *serious*. Nor did I expect from the Gravity, and Sincerity of Mr. *Baxter*, such a stumble at the Threshold.

*CATHOLICK COMMUNION* are two great words, and in pl. downright Construction, are the epitomy of two Articles of our Christian Creed, the Holy Catholick Church, and the Communion of Saints. And were you as plainly to be understood, I must acknowledge that, in Intitling me to the *defence* of it, you put an honour upon me, which I am more ambitious, than capable of deserving.

But 'tis a hard Case, that while we agree herein, and applaud the terms *Catholick Communion*; when you explain your sence (I think at least that) it goes beyond Catholick Communion: tho' that seem a contradiction *in adjecto* by excess, as *Roman Catholick* by *desect*.

For the genuine sence of Communion, I leave to you, and Dr. *Sherlock* to beat out, after such a dust raised, wherein 'tis vanished out of sight. I wish you had treated him more calmly, it would have been never the less *Christian*, or promotive of *Catholick Communion*; But the *Catholicism* of our Communion, you will needs have extending to an actual presential joyning with the *Parochial* Assemblies, in their Worship by the *Liturgy*; the Office of the Sacrament of the *Lords Supper* included; yet, not according to the

the National, *Diocesan* Constitution, established by Law, but as with a particular, divinely instituted, and compleat Church, *indpendant* on the *Diocesan*. I am sure Sir, that the defence of such a Catholick Communion, was none of my intention ; and I am as sure, that you find no such *sence* in my expressions. But if I must be for a while a *fel de se*, and represented as one, who under the pretence of vindicating Dr. *Owen*, have betrayed the cause I pretended to defend, by siding with his opposite in the very Case *Controverted* ; a little patience will discover *another scene*, wherein Mr. *Baxter* and the Vindicator will appear as if Mr. *Baxter* had forgotten his *Title*, and had a priviledge to dispose of me according to his present fancy.

Having gotten over your general Title, I have the prospect of another, which seems to be restrained to your *first section*. And it is, *The Consent of Dr. Owens Vindicator to the Catholick Communion defended by Richard Baxter*.

Here Sir you make a very hopeful abatement of what you stood upon in your *general Title*, there you will have me defend, here you come down to *Consent*. This is at least half a *retractation* at the next word ; yet when I have examined what you have to shew for the *latter*, it will appear to be a meer ungrounded *Chimara*.

You are pleased to distribute the *matter* of my Book under *four heads*. I shall pass by the first at *present*, and consider the second as most proper for me to do in this place ; and that you word thus.

II. *Your Consent to the main of the Cause which I defend, and your dissent from the persons whose words I confute : of this I shall thankfully take notice*. Here is not *Assent and Consent*, but *Consent and Dissent*. The last was certainly not *Argumentandi*, but *ornandi gratia* ; for if I consent to what you defend, I must needs dissent so far from what you Confute : but in *fine*, it will be neither the one, nor the other in what you express. Yet I must observe how the Market falls from defend, to Consent to the *Catholick Communion*, defended by Richard Baxter. And now 'tis come to *Consent to the main of the Cause which you defend*. Yet Sir, though I take no pleasure in difference, and contradiction ; I fear 'tis not yet an agreement.

Of this *Consent* you say you shall thankfully take notice, and accordingly in a few words following, you thank me *again and a-*

gain, for the particulars of my aforesaid Concession, or Consent. But worthy Sir, considering how courtly and friendly you have committed a *rape* upon my sense and words; and then come off so handsome, and smoothly with thanks for my Consent: I call to mind a much parallel Case, in the History of the Council of Trent, by Fryar Paul the Venetian (*mini*) page 322. Lib. 4.

Christopher Strassen one of the Ambassadors from the Elector of Branderburg, a Protestant Prince, to the Council of Trent; made a long Oration, shewing the good affection and reverence of his Prince toward the Fathers: without declaring what his opinion was in point of Religion. The Synod answered, (that is the Speaker in its name) That it heard with great Content, the Ambassadors discourse, especially in that part, where that Prince doth submit himself to the Council, and promiseth to observe the Decrees.-----

The answer which the Council gave was much marvelled at, in regard of the fair and advantageous manner of Contracting, pretending ten thousand by virtue of the promise, when the bargain was but of ten; for there was no more proportion than between these two numbers, in the reverence promised by the Elector, and the obedience pretended by the Synod to be given. It was replied for defence, That the Council did not regard what was, but what should have been said. And that this is an usual and pious assurance of the Holy Church of Rome; which yielding to the infirmity of her Children, maketh shew to believe that they have performed their duty.

Now to your proofs page 1. you say, That you thank me that I say page 3. I do not pretend (in what follows) to maintain against you, that it is unlawful to use a Form of Prayer, or comply with an imposed Liturgy, or under some Circumstances, to join in the use of ours in Worship. Neither shall I undertake to justify altogether the Twelve Arguments you have Printed as Dr. Owens, in order to refusing them.

I pray Sir compare your premises, with your Conclusion. I do not in such a Book maintain such and such things against you; Ergo I Consent to them, I defend them. I can tell you where you have refuted such a gross fallacy against your self very highly. And unless you winked hard, and very opportunely; you could not but see in my Book such other reasons given for my not maintaining those things against you in that Book, as would have more then sufficiently have prevented, or cured you of such a mistake.

And

And you cannot but know that they were in the midst between those words you cite. For you left out seven lines containing those *reasons*, and then patched together what went *before*, and what followed after the said *reasons*, immediately as if it had been my *continued* discourse. But whatever my Sentiments be of the above-said; I shall hardly *declare* my assent, and consent to all of them, or the rest of their fellows; 'till it be to better purpose, or by the temptation of a *Benefice*.

You say also in the same page, that you are pleased with my exposition of the Doctors words, and that upon the account of my *restrictions* of their sence. I have no reason to be displeased with this: yet I think it very fit for me to say that they will not bear the improvement you make of them, *sic*. I only here desire the men and women that have been with me, and profess that they thought the Doctors Arguments unanswerable against the lawfulness of joyning in the use of the Liturgy, to take notice of what his worthy Vindicator saith.

Sir I must desire those persons to take notice also, of what I have said, that you think not fit to repeat; and they will find my sence of *another* Countenance. Some People will take the meer Title Page of some answers for a *sufficient* determination, others will look only into the *Answerer*, and it may be no further than a few pages or passages. If such be mistaken, let them thank themselves; I see 'tis necessary to look into what both Parties say, let them be who they will: if a *Baxter*, and some other men of fame so far mistake.

But so far as your *last* passage cited, is grounded upon the *restriction*; I put on the sence of the said Doctors Position; It is so far from warranted thereby, that it is greatly *weakened*. For if that Position, and the Arguments be taken with those restrictions I said may be put upon them, they are much the more *unanswerable* for that.

You say, page 3 *But I think ten to one of the people commonly accounted Dissenters throughout England are of my mind, and are for Parish-Worship rather than either none, or worse. But by Dissenters I suppose you mean those of the Doctors mind, or your own.* I believe Sir, notwithstanding your thanks for my Charity and Reconciliation, you give in the next words, your Censure is too hard, and *uncharitable*, of those of the Doctors mind, and mine. I cannot imagine

gine they should be so atheistically or maliciously disposed as to chuse no worship or worse (all circumstances considered) rather than that of the Parish. If any adhere to a *worse* rather than that by *mistake*: I cannot call that their *Choice*. Dear Sir, I wish also you would either use more Accuracy your self (especially in the case of Censures) or forbear exacting it from others, under the penalty of I know not how many distinctions, to discover their confusion; though they are well enough understood by the willing. I beseech you Sir, who can tell what you mean by *Parish-Worship*? If all Parish Worship, I believe you are not for it your self rather than none *pro hic & nunc*, *Scil.* the faults (you say) are in the *Lyturgy*, and more especially in the Offices of Baptism and Burial, the bowing at the *pronouncing* the word Jesus, and toward the Altar, or the East. If of some *part* of the Parish Worship, I am sure they are not of *my* mind, or the Doctors either, that will rather have none than that, *Scil.* reading the Scriptures Preaching, Prayer, Singing Psalms. And the Doctor was for Church Worship too (you know) though not for ringing a Bell to proclaim where) whatever it cost. And you do not say rather than *none* more publick or private not Parochial locally, but *simply none*; which excludes not only *family* with four added, but single solitary worship; and all these *ad semper ex parte post*. Yet thus *roughly* am I and the Dissenters of *my* mind represented, as contradistinguished from those of yours, if I take you at the *worst* your expressions will bear, which I am far from, though they insinuate a great deal too much.

BUT now we are come to what I told you near the beginning of this Reply; What is become of my *Consent to*, and *Defence* of the *Catholick Communion defended* by Richard Baxter in the *Titles*? Why, this *Consent*, and *united Defence* is come to this, in the very *same Case*, and in the main of it, Mr. Baxter and ten to one, &c. are of *one* mind, and the Doctor and I of another.

Page 3. you repeat a passage of mine thus, and you add page 30. *And if (as you allow) the practical determination depends on the Circumstances of the persons, you reduce the controversy to a far narrower room than was by most supposed: And every one being best capable of understanding his own Circumstances, it will not bear great heat and importunity from another.*

From hence you interrogate, *But whence cometh those wrong suppositions*

positions of the most) if after twenty years Communion with the Parish-Churches, I venture on the Censorious so far, as to give my reasons for my own practice, and defend those reasons, and that practice against contrary writings? And such wise men as you are so reconcilable, and see how narrow the Controversy is; Whence comes it that must think it to be what it is not, against such frequent plain expressions? You and I may conjecture at the cause.

I must acknowledge, and I do it freely, which is more than you had in the Vindication, That I do not hold that worshipping God by a form of Prayer is *simply* unlawful, for the Reasons I mentioned, *pag. 25.* so that you and I differ not here in *Thesi.* And I also declare it my Judgment that those who differ from one another (in the cases controverted) ought not to deal out bitter Censures and Reflections for that cause: but to maintain brotherly Love, and Evangelical Peace; yea, and *Church Communion too*, so far as it may be without *sinful Terms*, or notorious Scandal, or what is *rationaly* suspected to be such. And I am so far from these heats and importunities, that (*whatever* my sense of your practice may be) I have been *thought*, and *said to be* a kind of an indifferent Luke-warm Person (if not of your mind) for Contradicting, and endeavouring to cure a bitter, and *over-hot* Censoriousness. But Dear Sir, I beg your Excuse if I answer your *Question* as well as I can, I am not dainty to affirm, that all sides are too guilty of Partiality, and *over-doing.* And you have less reason to blame those who think the differences very wide and weighty, and *much* greater than you *sometimes* render it, (For there is a great deal of difference between your High-water, and low-water-mark) when they see you so much concerned not only to defend your own practice, but to reduce others to it; and condemn those who dissent from you as no *mean* Malefactors, stigmatize them as *Separates*, such as unchurch all but themselves, proud *Ignorants*, and very bitter *Contemptuous* Language; as if with *Hannibal* your passage must be made, though with *Fire and Vinegar.* Indeed Sir, your Style is too hard, and heavy for fine work. Love, Reconciliation, and Peace, must be fished for with a Calm, not a Storm. What you say, *page 32. Humility and Love would conquer all the World,* is what I have said often, and thought a Thousand times. It were happy if such Notions were practiced by all that seriously profess Godliness, whether they are high or low in *outward* Tranquility: this would Represent Christianity in its proper



proper Colours, and turn the Churches shame, into the true Glory of Grace, and Peaceableness.

---

## S E C T. II.

*Mr. Baxter hath not proved the Charge of Errors on Dr. Owen, alias the Manuscript, sufficiently.*

**I** Shall next Consider what you say, to render my Confutation of your Charge of certain Errors on the Doctor, insufficient supposing the *Manuscript* to be his, *as you Printed it.*

My Construction, and Sense of the Position you dispute not, but are well satisfied with *Expressly.*

Page 2. You repeat the first Error *Charged* on the Doctor, but (I thank you) you have here reduc'd the said Error to the words and sense of the Mistake, though not the Order, and 'tis, *It is not in our Power to make use of any part of it, [the Liturgy you mean] as we shall think fit.* You add, *and I maintain that, though man hath not put that in our Power, God hath put it in our power to joyn in the good part of tollerable Worship, without owning the Faults, (or else we must joyn with none) you deny not this, page 27. but say, that he meant it of mans mans giving us Power, (which I never denyed) but it is God that we serve.*

*Ans'r.* But if he meant and said it too of the Power or Liberty given by man; and I proved it, and consequently, that the first Error you charged him withal was without ground, and your farther discourse not to the question, as I told you, page 27. I had what I pretended to.

But now you insist on what *you say* you maintained, and say *I denyed not that.* But Sir, this is another Province. And Reader, if the Reverend Author *mistakes* as to what he now saith he there maintained, and in saying I denyed not the sense he gives here, *I beg his and your pardon, if I transcribe more then I am otherwise willing: and I shall do it fully Word for Word.*

*I cannot think he bears himself upou saying I denyed it not*  
pag.



page 27. It is all one if I denyed it page 28. which I did, if there where any thing like the fence he intimates ; as for the words they are not in the Book I answered.

He saith Page 7. in his Answer to the Manuscript, *Though man gives us no such power, God doth ; as it is in my power to believe all that one speaketh truly and well, and not that which he speaketh amiss. I am not bound to own all that any Preacher or Priest shall say in the Church ; God put it into the Disciples power, to beware of the Leaven of the Pharisees, and yet to hear them. Proving all things, is not approving all things.*

What is in all this of joyning in the good part of publick tollerable Worship by a Lyturgy ? And how he maintained it by these Arguments, which are *nihil ad Rombum*, I cannot imagine, and think my Reader as little.

The first instance, *As it is in my power to believe all that one saith truly and well*, and not the contrary. I am sure it is not very sound as expressed, for our power is far short of this ; we have not such comprehensive understandings, but our belief may be imposed on inevitably by *falsehoods*, in the appearances of truth ; else our errors were much more culpable then sometimes they are. And I thought we had been disputing of *actual joyning in Worship*, and not of hearing any assertory Discourse.

The second instance, of what a Preacher or Priest shall say in the Church, we are not bound to own all that. Do you mean Sir, in Preaching or Praying in the Pulpit, or the Reading Pew ? 'Tis all in the Church, and 'tis all saying. I am herein of your mind Sir ; but if you intend it of the *Liturgy* read there, 'tis but *idem per idem* ; it is in your power or liberty not to joyn in all, because you are not bound to joyn in all. You will not take such Logick for good Coin from an Antagonist.

Third Instance, *God put it in the Disciples power to beware of the Leaven of the Pharisees, and yet to hear them.* This the Text tells you plainly to be mean of their false Doctrine they Preached, not of their Liturgy for Prayer and Praise ; and you say, Christ bid hear them ; would you have us go to the Liturgy only to hear it, or only as we should go to a Sermon ? and not worship by it ? And if we may take your own opinion in the matter, 'tis doubtful whether they had any *Liturgy* ; or if they had, it was a Scripture one ; certainly here was no bad leaven in that. But of this more hereafter.

Your 4th Argument or Instance, *Proving all things, is not approving all things, is ejusdem farinae*, and deviates from the question *toto Celo*. Though proving of pretended truth, brought into the Church, be a duty; and holding fast that which is good, is to be the consequent practice: Yet Sir, this concerns primarily the *Credenda*. But suppose it reach also to the *facienda*; it is as little to the purpose. For a stinted Printed Published Liturgy, may and ought to be *proved* before it be used in *Worship*, and not like *Sauls Armour* clept on *Dread* back, to fight in before he had *proved* it. Certainly Sir, you would not have people attend to the *Worship* by the Liturgy, in the Parish Assembly, and instead of having their affections and devotions stirred up, and carried on to God by the Liturgy, to be putting the scruple to their Consciences, whether they are *Praying* or *Sinning*. This proof should be made before they come *there*, which they may do at home when they have nothing else to do, and not remain a matter of *doubt* when it might before hand have been put out of doubt. I *hope*, nay I am *sure*, that you approve not the practice of many Ministers, who gave their *assent and consent* to the Liturgy on black *Barth*. (a day to be remembred) before ever they had seen so much as the *first leaf* of it; nor could, because it came not out *time enough*. This *proving* before using in *Worship*, you commended once as an *advantage* of a *stinted* form, which Ministerial, conceived, *extempore Prayer* hath not; but that's *forgotten* here.

In the same page, and next words you add; *You say*, when men pray, they bid us pray---In *extempore Prayer*, both are required to what is good; and then reply, *True: And I may joyn with the good of an extempore Prayer, without owning any evil in it.*

*Ans.* This is *Alexander-like*; cut the knot you cannot, or will not untie. Rather than allow me to speak argument or sence; you will mangle a sentence so; as I never met with any do the like before, I mean a good man and a good Schollar. When men pray, they bid us pray, what then? in *extempore Prayer*, both are required to what is good; both what? I assure you Reader, my Author will not help you to make it sence, if you rise over his whole answer for it. But seeing my whole sentence is but *short*, take it intire to a letter as my Author had it in my *Book*. 'When men Preach, they bid us hear, and the ear tries words: but when they pray, they bid us pray. And by the Liturgy our *Amen* is required, and

not

‘not our Opinion or Scrutiny: *In extempore Prayer* both are required to what is good; Now *I* will trust my Reader to find out the *sence* and the *reason* too. And though *I* can forgive my Author a thousand such wrongs, *I* must not excuse them. As to my Authors reply, ’tis by Concession *True*; and by repetition of what was to be proved, which is *inftar nihilis*. Now to my Author again.

*In the next lines you say, indeed you say page 28.* [‘The Mass is not more twisted in all the parts of it by Law, than the Liturgy; nor left less to our power to pick and *chuse*. If this union do render the far greater pollutions, the Heresy and Idolatry of the Mass infectious to the *whole Worship*: who can prove that the pollutions of other worship, when we are likewise commanded not to distinguish, or divide; doth not in their degree and kind, diffuse the taint *alike*.]

*I thank you Sir, for quoting thus much fairly, which yet seems to come not very freely; yet a good part of the Argument is left behind, and I shall take leave to add a snip of it more, which follows in the very next words* [‘Mental dividing or culling by secret disapprobation, and not joyning in our *hearts*, is all you pretend to; unless you did allow (which you do not determine) Mr. *Humphrey Fens* manner to say a *loud Amen* to every Prayer of the Liturgy, except the Prayer for the Bishops, and to that to dissent by a singular silence.'] Now Sir, instead of answering my arguments, you fall to making a Proposition what you will do in several cases; but at last you venture to say, *It is not the Conjunction, but the kind of the thing that maketh it unlawful*.

Do you not here roul *Sisyphus’s* stone? The Argument returns upon you again [‘There are good things in the Mass, yea, good Prayers directed to God only by Jesus Christ] shall we therefore go to Mass, and fall a picking and culling in our *minds*, and all is well?

You tell us not what kind of things in Conjunction make it unlawful, although *I* put you upon it page 29. of my Vindication in these words (but *I* did but *surdo narrare*) ‘Nor have you proved that no other sin but Idolatry and Heresy may justify refusing to worship by the Mass; nor that far less sins than they may not do it: Nor that the Liturgy hath not (some way or other) such sin cleaving to it, as is like the Leprosy, that could not be scraped, washed, or fired out.

Now Sir, *I* pray speak out ; and give us leave to go to Mass, ( if that be required, and the Church of *England* should comply with it ( which God forbid ) with your mental distinctions ; or tell us what sins twisted and mingled with a Worship may render joyning therewith unlawful.

But to be more faithful to *your* reasonings, than you have been to *mine* ; *I* shall recite, and examine them without picking and culling at all ; much less to your *disadvantage* ; only *I* shall tell my Reader by the way, that amongst all your *superabundant* distinctions, you give us not one that will include the *kinds* of the things joyned in a *mode* of worship, that make it unlawful to be used, *exclusive* of those which do not, or that *look like it* ; and so you leave us as you found us. Let us examine what you have done ; 'tis in page 2.

Ans<sup>r</sup>. *God is the master of his Worship* ; very right ! And 'twere well if there were no more. *I do what he bids me, though man contradict it.* This is much better, because practical. But shall we take it for an answer to my argument ? (as you call it) your answer is of doing what *God* bids you, tho *man* contradict it : the question is, of doing what *man* commands, mixed inseparably with what *God* contradicts. Take it at the best as to the question, it is but this : *I will go to Liturgy, to Mass* ( for that is the question ) and joyn in that part which *God* requires ( let it be mixed with what it will ) whatever men say to the contrary. This is the plain sense of your answer. But *I* believe far better things of you ; you explain *your self* thus.

*If God bid me hear, and believe the Scriptures, and man say hear also, and believe the Apocrypha. I will openly profess I obey God, and you no further than you contradict not God.* All this is good, but not in this place, because *impertinent*. What are we the wiser for it ? What is that to the question ? What you will profess in such a case ? Tell us what you will do, in the case before us, and give us a reason for't too. What man that would but be thought to fear God, would not profess such a general *dangerless Profession* in *high Change*, in a Popish Countrey ? Yet he will hardly merit the Chair in *this debate*, for such a resolution.

You proceed, *Rather than not hear the Scriptures, I will hear also the Apocrypha, but not believe it to be Gods Word. But if they bid me hear the Alcoram also, I will withdraw.*

*Ans<sup>r</sup>.*

*Ans.* What this is to the Purpose, I cannot tell. If you will do this, and much more ; the Question stands just where it did, excepting only the *Authority* of your inclination or *Example*. But if the Rectitude of what you say you *will*, and *will not*, may be examined, I may ask you,

1. What necessity there is, that you should hear the *Apocrypha*, or not hear the Scripture ?

2. Whether you mean that you will rather hear the *Apocrypha* read, as a part of Gods *Worship*, rather than forbear to hear the Scripture read, with other Concommitants in the *Liturgy*, at the same time, and place ?

3. Though in the mean time, you believe not the *Apocrypha* to be Gods Word: Do you believe that 'tis not intended it should be believed to be Gods Word ? or insinuated to be so ?

4. If any *other* writing, no more Gods word than the *Apocrypha*, and containing matter as lyable to Exception, and standing as *Candidates* for the honour of Gods word ; should be *joyned* to the Scripture, and read *just* in the manner as *they* are, bearing their part in Gods *Worship*. ( for Instance, The works of *Seneca* History of the Nine Worthies, Popish *Legenda*, of their Saints Miracles, *Aesops* Fables, ) Would you rather joyn in this *Worship*, with your *mental* Reservations and *Distinctions*, then forbear or with-draw ?

Lastly, If there be not *some*, yea *many* things in the Alcoran, as *true*, and as good as many things in the *Apocrypha* ? And not *many* things more false and worse in the Alcoran, than *some* things in the *Apocrypha* ?

And if the Books fore-mentioned, may not claim a *Parity* ? *Judith*, *Bel* and the *Dragon*, *Tobit*, with the *History*, *Legends*, and *Fables* ? When all these *Queries* are resolved, which stand as fair for your Embraces as what you assent unto, we may the better understand *you*, but not the Question.

Next you say somewhat in room of a Proof, That it is not the *Conjunction*, but the kind of the thing that maketh it [the *Worship*] unlawful, viz. An honest weak man, an *Antinomian*, an *Arabaptist*, a *Presbyterian*, or whoever you dissent from in tellerable cases, may mix his opinion, and faulty Expressions and Methods with his Prayer and Sermon ; as intimately as evil is mixt in the *M*s ; and yet you will not refuse *Communion* with him.

*Ans.* All you aim at by this, is but *argumentum ad hominem*, and such a one too, as is but a *falso ad jus*: but here is neither. The Case with that in Question is, *impar & Congressus*. 'Tis true, if what yo say of me here be true; that I do not reject Communion for such kind of Faults in the *Administrator* of the Worship and his Administration: and I will allow you *that* as easily, as that a man must not put away his Wife for *every* fault: But yet I must add, that you put the Case *ill*, and strain it off the Tenters, to make it reach *yours*. For, there *may* be such faults mixed, doth not reach to *there is*, there *must* be, there *shall* be such faults; which you know is said of the *Lyturgy*, by them you *oppose*. Again, the faults in a *Sermon* are not *ad rem*, much less *ad idem*.

Nor are they that concern the more direct Worship, as Prayer and Praises, as *intimately mixt* as in the Mass; which you please to instance in to make the worst on't, or our *Lyturgy* either, as to what faults are in the matter; for they are not *imposed* on *us* to hear and worship by, either by *Law*, nor as necessary terms of Communion, nor are they *all* justified as *no faults*, nor are they *bound* to commit them by *Law*, nor are they known to us *before* we joyn, that such faults will be; (except what common infirmities may infer) nor are they *perpetuated* by a *Law*, nor is it a *Crime*, much less a *Penal*, a capital one, to *Reform* them, to advise of, yea reprove them for such faults. (Except the Errors of Opinion) they are confessed to be faults *particularly*, bewailed as their *Sin and Burden*. And they pray and endeavour to do their work for *matter* and manner of *Expression* with *greater* perfection: This may be said of the *best* that yet are *Exorcists* and weak. But tell me of one of our Ministers of the *Lyturgy* that doth, or dare make publick Confession, of one fault in matter or form in the *Lyturgy*; and pray to God to Reform it, and help them to do it better? or where doth the *Lyturgy* direct to such a Confession and Prayer? And yet 'tis the whole of *necessary legal Ministry*, with one of the *Homilies* added once in a long while.

But Sir, you might have remembered what I said, 'Page 29. (but it was not for your turn) There is no Part y in a Word or Sentence, exceptionable in a Conceived Prayer *extempore*, with the *Lyturgy* in its *intire* form, with all known or doubtful Circumstances. Many may be found who in Conceived *extempore* Prayer, do not pollute them with failings in the *matter*; and

‘and others that have Errors in their *minds*, do not put them into ‘the *Words* of their Prayers. So that Communion with these more able Orthodox men, is nothing so *dangerous*, nor lyable to your *Re-crimination*.

There remains one thing more, in which you sum up your *sence* of you Argumentations in this Paragraph, and it is by a *Similitude* which proves *nothing*. But if it may help us to understand your *meaning*, I will not *Envy* my Reader the sight of it. *It is lawful* (say you) *to drink beer that hath bad water mixt, rather than none: But not to drink that which hath Poyson equally mixt.*

*Ans.* Here is a *Ratherism*, and a down-right Negative. The first (if I can understand you) is meant of our *Lyturgy*, the latter of the Popish Mass. But to follow your *Similitude*, must one of these be our Election? must we take this *bad* mixture, or not drink *at all*, and consequently die of a *sullen Humour*, or a *Pal-late more nice than wise*? You can tell a better way than *either*; and that is, to drink that which is more pure, wholesom, and *relishable*, if it may be had for Love or *Money*. And you believe Sir, *they* may have *better* that will but go to the *Cost* on’t, though sometimes you express *Peters* pity, *Be it far from thee, this shall not be unto thee*, Mat. 16. 23. And you know what thanks he had for it from his Master.

For the latter, you are *more out*, or more *short*, or *both*. It is not *lawful to drink that which hath Poyson equally mixt*: you are *more out*, because ’tis *less* to the *Purpose*. Remember Sir, you are proving that ’tis the the kind that’s in Conjunction, which makes the Worship *unlawful*; and now you are come from the *quale* to the *quantum*; and in *truth* to *both*: Poyson, the *quale*, equally mixt, the *quantum*.

If I said also that ’tis more *short*, ’tis proveable *enough*; for should we take no better *heed*, than to your *Direction*, we were in the Eyes of all Men (and your own too, when you look on this Passage again) utterly *undone*. May we drink *Poyson*, so there be not full as much Poyson as better Liquor in the Draught; or any Poyson at all? I know Sir, though you have worded it thus *unhappily*, your *meaning* is still; we may go to the *Lyturgy*, rather then to the Mass. And I am so far of your mind, but as to what you have yet said, *restat Probandum*.

You proceed and say, To page 29. of my Vindication, *I think if*



*a Turk pray against Idolatry, Murder, &c. that Prayer is materially good; But as to goodness from a holy Principle, no Hypocrites is good.* You had said in your Answer to the Manuscript, page 7: *Heathens and Turks have good Prayers*, but may we joyn with them? you have not told us why not; but only in Case of their being twisted with *such* Heresie and Idolatry. 'But I had denyed Heathens and 'Turks having good Prayers, because without Faith in Christ, 'though they may be Prayers for some good thing. This Doctrine you cannot bear; it being in Contradiction to what had past the Warrant of your Pen; but you will bring it over to another Tryal, and you will say they may be materially good; I said so before, but that does not so well like you; but being for the matter good, they must be good Prayers.

I will put you a few Cases, to see how your Rule looks. Suppose a man utter the matter of a good Petition in Sport, or Derision of Religion, as has been sometimes in *Plays*; are they good Prayers? Conjuring shall have good Prayers too, by this Rule; for sometimes it contains some matter of Petition for good. The Heathen prayed to *Bacchus* for a good Vintage, to *Ceres* for a good Harvest; The matter of their Prayers were good, though directed to Idols; but by your Rule these are to be justified as good Prayers. How dear is self-defence! that will not permit an Eminent Christian Divine, to allow that there can be no good Prayers without *Faith in Christ*, but it must be distinguished out of doors, to save the Turks and Heathens good Prayers; because he had unadvisedly said, they had good Prayers.

You Conclude this Argument saying, *The Insufficiency of my Answer you no way manifest, 'till you prove that I must joyn with all that is in publick Worship, or with none.* If so, your Answer is *unanswerable*; but though I attempt no such impossible things, I will be content to stand to the Readers Judgment (that doth not allow a name to weigh too much) if your Answer be not apparently insufficient.

Yet Sir, beside what I have already said to difference the faults of the Worship I have described; and that other Worship you will bring under the same difficulty; I will add, that where Worship is according to *Divine Institution*. (which doth not suppose them obliged by it to be *Angels*, but men, men subject to *Infirmities*) And these men do *Profess* so far as they have attained, to walk by  
the



the rule of *Gods Word*, and to reform, and rise to a nearer Conformity to the Divine Rule, as they shall be able to *understand it*. And their Worship contains *nothing* in it, either by *excess or defect*, which excludes the *Essentials* of Christian Worship, *acceptable* to God through Christ, when tendred in *Sincerity*. I believe these may be joyned with, without *partaking* with their Sins in Worship; while I am not immediately guilty of the *same* Sins. This may be said of the fore-described? And worthy Sir, I know not by what *other* medium to set up a Fence against the most *polluted* Worship in the *World*, that hath somewhat good in it, and pretending God the Object. When *Temptation* is at the door, meer *mental Distinctions* will undo all, and betray Religion *Peice-meal*. If you, or any other can instruct me better, I shall be thankful for it. In the mean time, I am well content with what I have said.

---

### S E C T. III.

*The Remains of what Mr. Baxter saith in his Defence, against my Discharge of Dr. Owens pretended Errors, Considered.*

S I R, The Doctor, so far as concerned in the *first* Error by you charged on him, being after so large an Encounter *Revindicated*. You making me little to do, and next to *nothing*, about all the rest, you have spared me much farther travail in that Province. I hear no more of your Proof of the other seven or eight which I defended, to be the Doctors Errors, or any Bodies else, except in two Passages, which I shall also Consider.

You say, page 27. *Some other Practical Doctrines we differ about*, as where you report me to say, 'Page 30. [ I doubt not to affirm, 'that doing that which a *Law* requires, so far as the *Intention* is 'moved by the Law, is a *justifying* of it. And submitting to any 'Law, upon the Consideration of its *Penalties*, is so far a *justifying*

D

'ing

ing its *preceptive* part, as not so great an Evil as its *Penal*. ]

These two Sentences, you charge with *two* faults. The first of a Defect in *Limitation*, the second of a Defect in *Limitation* and *Distinction*.

These Sir, (if *just*) are a great *Abatement* of that *bad* Countenance you put upon the supposed Error (which *I defend*) in your Answer to the Manuscript, Page 7. viz. *That our Communion justifieth all the Laws that impose the Lyrurgy; yea the Penal Severities; This is too gross an Error to be defended, with any shew of Proof.*

Before you fall to the Proof of my foresaid Defects in the *Defence*, you except against another Passage of mine in your *Way*; which *I shall* take out of the way, before *I deal* with the others: 'tis this, [ 'None that *I know of* say it, [ *Communion in the Lyrurgy* ] is a *Duty simply*, or without any Dependance on *humane* Sanction. ] Your Design in this exception seems to me, to prevent or fence your self against such Objections as might be made against your *own Practice*, which was not to hold this *Communion*, when the Sanction of the Law lay (at least) asleep. But Reverend Sir, if that be it; *I shall* say, that 'tis little my Business, or inclination to Censure, or judge my Brother in doubtful Controverted matters. To his own Master he standeth or falleth.

Had you told me of any one Person, Author or other, that says 'tis a *Duty simply*, it had been somewhat like a Conviction of my saying to be culpable: But all you say, is what *your self* have said, and *practiced*, which no way *Contradicts* me neither. You say, *I have largely* told you, that *I take it to be a Duty to hold such Communion where no better at least is;-- And that it is in Obedience to Gods Commands, more than mens, that I have gone to the Parish-Churches; And would have gone as much if the Law had not Commanded it, but only deprived me of better.* But Sir, is that a *Duty simply* considered, that is obliged to, only by that great *strait*, no better is to be had; Worship God *thus*, or not at all? Or is that no Dependance on *humane* Sanction, which depends not only on the Laws (not for bidding) but depriving you of better? *I think* the Sanction of the Law goes a great way, where it not only commands, but actually and effectually destroys all other ways, but that which it prescribes. *I wonder* none of our modern wits and men of the times, in Press or Pulpit, have ever yet found in their hearts to say, that 'tis *simply* a Duty, and thereby we are obliged to it in

Con-

Conscience toward God, without the *medium* of the Magistrates Command or Compulsion. Little we hear from them but Law, Law, Jupiter & Fulmina. You might have spared me, and your self this Trouble, had you not been offended at your own Shadow.

Now for my defective Limitation, you say; But as to your undoubted Affirmation, I am as much past doubt that it is not true, as you unlimitedly express it. The intention may be moved by a Law for the Effects or Consequents sake; and not justify the Law, but only justify the Act of the Subject. Yea it may be moved by the formal Authority of the Lawgiver, express by the Law; and yet not justify the Law.

Ans. How happily have I sped in this Argument! to have nothing Objected but a little want of Accuracy, which the best writer may sometimes be charged with.

Truly Sir, when I wrote what you so confidently Contradict, unless I had limited it: I did not think of a Lecture of Juris-prudence. I wrote that which concerned Common people to understand; and I doubt not still to say, that I wrote Common Sense, and I was very well understood, though I did not trouble them with farther Limitations. But Sir, was not that a Limitation sufficient, [ So far as the Intention is moved by the Law. ] But you teach me that the Intent may be moved by a Law, for the Effects or Consequents sake, and not justify the Law. I assure you Sir, I have rubbed my morning Eyes, and cannot yet see the Defect.

I say, that if the intention be moved by the Effects or Consequents, as such, ( simply as such ) though the Law be the Occasion, the Intention is not moved by the Law at all. For such an Intention would not be moved by a Law Considered without those Effects and Consequents; and it would be moved with those Effects and Consequents, though they had no Relation to a Law at all. Therefore your arguing from the Intention moved by the Effects and Consequents, as not sufficient to justify the Law, is but making an Argument of your own to confute instead of move. But let us try if your instances will give more light.

Joseph and Mary were taxed with others, by Augustus Law; they were moved by that Law, and its Effects to pay the Tax: yet justified not the Law.

Ans. All you can prove is, that they paid the Tax, the mere matter of Fact: The Text speaks nothing ( and therefore you can

prove nothing) of their *Intention*, or by what it was moved. Again, *The Israelites might obey the Philistines that forbade them Smiths and Swords, &c.* How prove you that? and if you proved it, what follows, but an *All-significant*, or an *insignificant & Cetera*? Again, *When Christ sent Peter to take a Fish, with Money in his mouth, and pay Tribute; the Law moved his Intention, because of the Offence that would follow the breaking of it: and yet his Answer intimateth that he justified not the Law.* Indeed Sir, I wonder at your imposing, as if I and your Readers had not read the Scripture, nor were Masters of a grain of *Sence*. The Scripture saith plainly, that he did it to avoid the *Offence*; that moved this *Intention*, not a word of the Law here. And for his Answer, it imported plainly, that he would keep his *Sence* to himself, that he might neither offend *Cesar*, nor his Countrey men, nor ensnare himself. Truly Sir, I am constrained to speak plain; half a good Argument is worth all these, and an hundred more such. You have a heap behind, of mere *unproved Dictates*, very unworthy of your Pen; The intelligent wary Reader will easily see it: and yet you conclude this Argument, with *Dear Brother I will not aggravate your Error, by its ill Consequences.* I thank you for your Love, but I need not your Favour in this Case, unless for their cause, who will take a mans Arguments to be knockt dead beyond Redemption, if Mr. Baxter hold up but a *Straw* at them.

Somewhat must be said to my Defect in the latter Sentence; of which you say, *And as to your second Information, it is not true without Limitation, that* [ 'Submitting to a Law, on Consideration of the Penalties, is so far a justifying its preceptive part, as not so great an evil as the Penal ] You say, *this is confused work, and why? The Preceptive part of the Law, is actus precipientis, the Commanders Act.* Again, *Forgive me for telling you, that you should have distinguished the preceptive part of the Law from the matter commanded by it, and the Evil of the Law and Law-maker, from the Evil of the Obeyer.* And what then? *And then have Concluded only, that he that obeyeth a Precept only to avoid the Penalty, professeth the Penalty to be worse then his Act of Obedience: But he doth not make it worse then the Law, or the Lawmakers Sin.*

*Ans.* Reverend Sir, I am not yet so Learned, or self-conceited, as not to be willing to learn of a far meaner Tutor: But still with this Proviso, that he inform, but not impose on my Understanding.

I could ( without great difficulty ) have distinguished the *pars legislativa*, from the *actus imperantis*, and that from the *actus imperatus*, and all from the *Lex formata*, and so on. But *cui bono*? my Reader would have been little the wiser. Could my Reader so mistake, as to *imagine* I meant that the evil of the Penalty was not so great as the *Law-makers Sin*? and is not the *actus imperatus*, included in the matter commanded in the *Sence of the preceptive part*? And I think, I was distinct enough, where my Reader might well understand, and could not by any fault of mine, miss my meaning. But Sir, whatever Pleasure you take in it, I take little, and ( it may be ) our Readers none at all, in *this* part of the Debate, wherein we do but *res parvas magno Conatu agitare*.

You give me *no more* occasion to contend against you, by Answering what you oppose to my Defence of the Doctors pretended Errors. You remember me of one thing more in the *Polemical* part of my Book, but not by way of *Contradiction*, Scil. Page 32. I say, [ ‘ Doth he say a word of owning Parish-churches and Worship ; ] Thus much, and *no more* you repeat of *that* Section. And you Answer, *If you, or he say nothing against these, we shall leave the Diocesan to others. But if you be the man, I have lately privately written to ; I doubt not but I have proved to you, that Parish Churches that have good Ministers, are true particular Churches, and those Ministers true Pastors : and that any Bishops holding the contrary, doth not disprove it.*

This *Snap* of my Defence *broken off* from its *Fellows*, your Reader will understand little by, but I suppose, you only designed to bring in by that, what you say you wrote *privately* : but I perceive you know not to *whom*, at least whether it were to me, or to somebody *else* : However, this Notice is very welcome. As to what you say you have *proved*, I do very much doubt it. If I had had the happiness to have seen those *Proofs*, and they had proved convincing to me; you had saved me the Labour of agitating *that* question in a *following* discourse. And I take it to be *so much* more worth determining, as it seems to be the very *Basis* of your Zeal for compleat *Parochial* Communion.

After your Notices of what I had done in Defence of the Manuscript ( which was as much as my *express* design, *viz.*  
to

to prove that it was not such a feeble and *gross* thing as *you* Represented it, ( let it be whose it would ) you observe some things *page 4.* I have not done. That is, that I have not defended the *rest* of the Manuscript. And *page 5.* you thank me for defending *none* of those you innumerate. I take not your thanks *amis*, tho' I had other Reasons for not doing it, then such as it may be you *Suppose*; yet such as may be easily supposed, if you *please*.

And not to suffer you to be grateful *alone*, I thank you also, that you said so *little* to defend your charge of the first Error you charged on the Doctor, or Manuscript, and that you said *less* to the second, and nothing at all to all the rest ( six or seven in number ) which I discharged from *that* imputation. And I thank you so much the more, as you were much more obliged ( by Temptation ) to defend your *own*, than I was to defend another mans.

#### S E C T. IV.

*Mr. Baxters Concessions to the Doctors personal Worth, and Sence of his ill-treating the Doctors Name, thankfully acknowledged.*

**A**S to what concerns your Intituling Dr. *Owen* to the twelve Arguments, according to your *Printed* Edition, and some ill resented mixtures in your Contradictions of them; your Christian and ingenuous Expressions are such, as well deserve to be a *Winding-sheet* to all Offences, which took life from your Reflections on the Doctor. And first you say, that as to my Vindication of Dr. *Owens* Personal worth, you and I are agreed, and you have *nothing in that to say against me*.

This I thankfully acknowledge, and I shall not be the only Person sensible of it. *Cæsar* was said to confirm his *own* Statues, by securing those of *Pompey*.

Beside

Beside divers other Passages of the import abovesaid, you have one in page 8. which I shall transfer *hither* for Reasons I shall give by and by. I do but tell my Reasons for naming the Doctor, but I undertake not to justify either that, or the manner of my writings, from Mistake, Imprudence, or other Faultiness. I suppose you to be a man whom I take from my heart to be far better, and wiser than my self: And therefore as I thank you for your gentle, friendly Reprehensions; so I profess that my very esteem and Reverence of your Judgment makes me suspect that I have done amiss; when I see it not in the cause it self. That I could have defended the cause of Love, and Communion against those Arguments; without taking notice of the Author, and without wronging the Nonconformists, who will be charged by his Name, I did, and do wish; But I thought it could not well be done: If in this I mistook, I ask pardon of God, and man; for so I must do for my Sins known and unknown.

More to this purpose the Reader may find in this page, and page 29. Thus far I have repeated your words, because they are powerful Persuasions to Heart-Reconciliation, and allaying of Animosities; where Principles of Christianity, or *humanity* prevail, and are attended to: And more likely to do good that way with most, than many strong Reasons of another Countenance, if they were to be had.

And indeed Sir, you have in this Passage expressed so much of Humility, and Self-denial; as few of *those* who shall yet remain unsatisfied, would imitate under less difficult Circumstances. And I expect some may read them *here*, whose Prejudice will not permit them to seek it *elsewhere*. The Value you are pleased to put upon the supposed Author, is (I confess) so great, that I should not for Modesty sake have mentioned (much less *assured*) but that (whoever you apprehend him to be) I have reason enough to transfer it upon some far more worthy Person than my self.

There is one thing pertaining to this head, which I shall willingly dispatch in this place; and it concerns a Request of yours, an earnest Request, *Scil.* page 7. *All that I yet desire, is to be able to deny it to be his, that the next man that hits the Nonconformists in the Teeth with it as the Doctors, may be told it is not his: If you can and will but tell me that you believe it not to be his, that I may have but so much to say; I will thank you, and make it publicly known.*

Dear



Dear Sir, a far *less* earnest Request, yea less than a *Request*, would have drawn from me a *greater* matter than this to gratify you. I therefore say, that I cannot affirm, or deny it to be his, of mine *own* knowledge: for I never received it from his *hand*, nor ever heard him own or deny it to be his, more or less. As to what I believe of it, I shall be *open*, and ingenuous with you. I do believe that much of the *Substance* of it was written by the Doctor, and by him read to some few Persons (probably to have their *Opinion* of it, and of what use it might be to some persons concerned in the then *present* difficulties, (and not yet *past*) and that somebody having gotten the Copy, took Liberty to disperse it to some *others*, whose Case or Curiosity moved them to desire it: But I do not believe, that the Doctor intended it for the *Press*, or to be expoled as it *was*, or that he ever *wrote* it, or owned it, or would have owned it *his*; as it is in *your* Edition, without very *Considerable* Alterations.

And I having had since I wrote the Vindication, the *like* Opinion from some, who were *most* likely to know the *whole* truth of this matter: I am farther Confirmed in the belief of what I say now, and said *before* in the Vindication, page 1. yet in my poor Judgment, 'tis enough for you that you cannot *affirm* it to be his: Nor any other who shall pretend it for *whatever* ends. And be it his, or not his, (seeing he did not think meet to avow it publickly) 'tis becoming wise men, to let it stand, or fall, according to its own proper merit.



## S E C T. V.

*Mr. Baxters fourth Section Considered, being a Miscellaneous Collection of various matters Contained in the Vindicator, and his Animadversions on them.*

THE Close of the first Paragraph of your fourth Sect. page 29. gives a full *Discharge* to the Doctors Name, (so far as you concerned it in your Answer to the Manuscript) in these words; *I wholly follow the Rule you mention, to chuse that which doth most good, and least hurt. And truly, the Reverence of your own, and some other Judgment telling me, that it doth more hurt than good, doth turn the Scales, and make me repent, that I named the Doctor.*

Reverend Sir, I thank you for *thus* much, whoever or whatever was your Motive. And I shall the more patiently bear the load you discharge on me; though I shall take leave to *poize* it, and inquire *Quo Warranto*.

A Warfare, a Voyage must not be *undertaken*, but with expectation of some *blowes*, or *foul Weather*. After a *Calm*, comes a *Storm*, which was brewing all the while, I now perceive; and it begins thus, page 29. *I leave your charges against me to their best Advantage to the Reader, though my Inclination is much to open Mistakes. I may give a brief touch to your self, for your Information; which I expect not should affect the Reader, suppose your book to lie open before you.*

*Ans.* It is of rare example for any, much more Mr. Baxter, *toto pectore, telum recipere*; and not to expose mistakes that are to his disadvantage. But Sir, your brief touch for my Information, I expect it to be neither *brief*, nor a gentle touch, nor much to my information; except that in the best of men *nature will work*. And whereas you say, *you expect not that it should affect the Reader, &c.* I know not what to think of it, unless that your Readers have so little

cern for me, that if you should clap a Cupping Glas to me, I shall have none of their pity. But I am not Doctor Owen.

You begin to inform me by *examining* me, and go on mostly in that *form* of information; which seems to aim rather at your own: But to be brought to the Rack, and *dicere causam* is a hard Chapter said A. B. Land, If (say you) you thought them not good enough to be his, nor intended for publick view; Why do you wrong him so much, and the people much more, as to divulge them with his name?

I see Sir, you need to be better informed your self of this matter, before you turn Informer to me. Who told you that I ever divulged them to any one person? And I tell you, that though I had seen them about a year before; I never read them, nor heard them read, except some part of them *Cursorily* once: And I never was Master of any one Copy of them, true or false; 'til I had your Printed Edition. I must therefore send this *Quere* home again to your self, to whom it much more belongs than to me, and as the Divulger with his name, more I think than to all the world beside.

Again, Do good men take it for a privilege, to hurt the Church, *uncontradicted*?

Ans<sup>w</sup>. Why ask you me this question, rather than of any other? You might have answered it your self. Certainly none but the worst of men take it for a privilege under that name; but many good men do hurt the Church, and take it to be good (by mistake, ing either the Church, or the hurt) Who these good men are is, *his sub judice*, all are said by one or other to do it, all justify themselves from it. Yet they may be most guilty of this *ignorant zeal*, (which is the best can be said of it) that least suspect themselves, and most hotly charge others: I will say for mine own part, that I need scarce any thing more to set my judgment right of my self or others than *impartial self-reflection*. By the question you seem to say I am the man, and I will put it fairly to my self. You may do as you please.

You say, It is zeal for a Sect against Unity, which corrupt nature is for.

Ans<sup>w</sup>. And there is a zeal too for Unity and Uniformity, which corrupt nature is for, and you are against. 'Tis too common a Cant to brand those for Sects, that are not just of our own *scamling*.

ing. A very easie and *impertinent* way of abusing: A *Cothurnus*, that serves every ones turn.

Again, *I doubted not but guilt would be impatient.* *Ans.* What then? Is impatience a proof of *guilt*? or every defence against wrongs, impatience? You should not have cast *this* stone. You proceed:

*It was your Party that wronged his name, by divulging that which you take for his disgrace.*

*Ans.* My Party! Is not that Mr. *Baxter* for one? *I* found Mr. *Baxter*, and the Doctors Vindicator of one Party in your Titles, *without* doors, and *within*; Who parted us since, and made me of another Party? Not *I*, *I* am sure; *I* am the same *I* was; and that is, of no Party at all. But if you will disagree with your *self*, and make Parties in one single individual, look you to that. Who of the Party do you mean who take the *Manuscript* for the Doctors disgrace? O! they were offended that it was printed under his name. And if you or any of your friends should express *offence*, at your Manuscripts being Printed under *your name*, which you never intended for the Press, nor *Consented* should be so Published; would you allow *this* inference, that they were taken for your *disgrace*? Beside, whatever some may think of themselves, *I* do not think, that the ablest men spit such perfections, as without Correction, or more ado, may without *wrong* to their names ( and somewhat else too ) be exposed to the worst that an adversary can make of them.

Page 30. you say, *It's strange so knowing a man should think that bad Arguments with a valued name, are not dangerous! Yes evn: against common sense, as those for Transubstantiation. To confute your self, you add [Add to what?] that on all sides peoples opinions are mostly, and most STRONGLY mastered by Affections, and it's beyond all our power to Cure the disorder. And yet is there no danger from Names?*

*Ans.* You may cross *Shins*, and fight against your self when you please. *I* delight in no such Combats: But its more strange, that so *pious* a man should take such Courses to wrong his very Friend, and render him Cross to Truth, and himself at once, by a half-faced Representation.

Reader, all that the Reverend Author pretends to ground these two charges upon, is contained in a few Lines, of which by giving:

a part, he ( I will not say cunningly ) spoils, and perverts the sense of the whole; they are in page 7. [ 'Dear Sir, I fear that those People, who have not the skill to answer the twelve Arguments, will be found to want skill enough, to discover the *Strength* of *yours*. And I confess 'tis matter of *Lamentation*, that on all sides Peoples Opinions are mostly, and most strongly master'd by their Affections; and 'tis beyond all our power to cure the Disorder. ]

Now Reader, if acknowledging, and *lamenting* the danger also, *he saying* there is *no* danger in *valued* Names, Mr. B. is right, and I am not wronged.

Truly Sir, I am sorry that you cannot yet ( after all you have said ) get over your naming the Doctor, but must be looking back to a Vindication of what you have so *often*, and so pathetically *confest*, to be *faulty*. So hard a thing it is for good men, to digest a Self ( but half *Constrained* ) *Condemnation*.

And I take leave to add, that the danger of deceiving by valued names, should deeply oblige *those*, whose names are *much* valued by one sort or *another*, not to speak or write *hand over head*, but with such wariness and Caution, that they may be indeed guides, and not *Snares* to their valuers. And to others, that they would have a care of *over-valuing* names, and learn to judge of things by their proper Evidence.

Page 31. *If numbring mens Errors, used to do hurt; be worse than committing them, or defending them, I mistook. I Consent that you do so by me, so you speak nothing but the Truth.*

*Ansiv.* And did you not *mistake*, if it was not *worse*? I have thought hitherto, that to do *ill* was a *mistake* ( at least ) though not so bad, as that which is *worse*. I thought also, that this was one manner of treating the Doctor, wherein you acknowledged your self *Faulty*: But if you retract this, as you ( seem also to ) have done your *other* acknowledgments; I am at Liberty to recall my thanks. But for your Consent that I should give you the *same* measure, upon the Condition limiting, *scil. of Truth*: I shall not take you at your word; because, I take *Volenti non fit injuria*, to be but a crooked Rule. Nor shall I ( though with your leave ) *doubly* condemn my self, by doing that which I condemned in others.

In the same page you say, *I am sorry that you feign the healing Parliament to have disowned our Repentance. They forbade Reproaching and troubling one another; but not remembering our Sin, not feeling when we suffer, nor asking what caused it; to stop the like again, if not for a Cure.*

*Ans.* Sir, you teach here a Notion very new (at least to me) *scil.* To affirm that which is not true in Argumentation, (which may be thro' mistake) is to feign. Much joy Sir, of this invention, I wish you. But if you be never sorry, till I feign or affirm that great Absurdity, I hope that from henceforth you shall be a joyful man. If that Parliament by the Act of Oblivion did not *bar* such Criminations by any Persons, much more by private Persons. (whatever pretence they might make of causing the Criminals to *repem* of it, by so doing) I spake not *their* Sence, nor to *my* purpose: But if they did, I needed not (according to your notion) to feign, when I had such Realities on my side.

You say also in the same page, *You would put such terms upon me in dispute, as Veron devised to put on the Protestants. I must oppose his Doctrine, only as in the Syllables written, Accidents in Worship signifie you think at least an integral part.*

*Ans.* I wish the Papists would never put *harder* Terms upon the Protestants, than not to corrupt their Arguments, by chopping and changing Words at their *Pleasure*; which you have often done in the Tract I examined: I told you of many such faults; you deny not the Fact in *one*, but here you *justify* it; and you justify it here as an insignificant Alteration. But you know that the Doctor thought not *so*, for he insisted on the sence of that insignificant Syllable, (as you take it) And I insist on it in my Examination of your Answer, which the Reader may understand (if he will look into my Book) to be of another Countenance than your *broken*-glass Represents. What work may men make with *Arguments*, if they take *this* Liberty, when they pretend to give the Authors own words; by all the Tokens usual: if they shall chop and change Words, Syllables, or *some* one Letter! May they not put *yea*, in the room of *may*; and *may* in the room of *yea*; and make their Author speak *what*, and no more then they list. 'Tis one thing to Commend exactness, and another to *use* it. But if you *justify* this Liberty, we may expect you will take it for the future, and then there will be no dealing with you.

Page 30. *Its wisely done not to own the Cause I oppose, and yet not let men know whether it be for fear of the Law, or because you are against it.*

*Ans.* I suppose Sir you mean *cunningly*, a sort of Wisdom I am little acquainted with. I am too open and fair for such Politicks. I told you the cause, *page 3, page 23. and page 39.* You might have given your self sufficient reasons for it, without asking them of others, much more being told them. If you could not see them *there*, it may be to as little purpose to repeat them *here.*

I hope you do not think that *Laws, Penal Laws*, are not to be feared. What were they else made for? You have indeed written concerning the *Diocesan established Constitution*, and the manner of *imposing*, as a man that feared not the Laws. But you have made such a Compensation for *that*, by your Zeal expressed for the *Liturgy*, and *Lay-Conformity*, as may plead your pardon for that wrong. I believe, and not alone, that by your Writings, Examples, and *valued name*, serving flesh and blood with a Wind, (which is no friend to Losses and Crosses) you have served the interest of the *present Constitution*, beyond all that hath been said for it by those, whose *Station* may promise the service of their *utmost Abilities.*

But for the *Cause you oppose*, and oppose with so much heat, I have not found you always of the *same mind.* Change of Weather hath great influence on some (and not only the most *infirm*) Constitutions. I beg your pardon if I make a little Retrospect to your Sentiments by-past, and sometime since.

I might begin with your *Savoy-Dispute or Conference*, wherein 'tis offered against a *Liturgy*, that *Cold Prayers are like to have a cold Return.* But that being *viva voce*, in transient breath, I shall not so much insist on it; but remember you of what you said elsewhere, for Example.

*But we think it was not the Jesuites that first said, Out of the Abundance of the Heart, the Mouth speaketh. 'Tis natural for the Heart to lead the Tongue. And men are more affected by words which come from Affection, than by those that do not. And reading words written by another, when we speak to God, is not so natural a Signification of Desire, or other Affliction; as speaking them from the present*



present Dictate of the Heart; for any Child can do the one, and it is not the usual Signification of Seriousness in other Actions.

Ministers should be better acquainted than the People, how to speak to God and man. It is their Office, and therefore, it belongeth to them to chuse the Words, which are fittest: and to set up a Ministry that can do neither, is to befriend the Prince of Darkness against the Kingdom of Light, and to be a deadly Enemy to the Church and Souls; and to set up a Ministry that need not do it, is the way to set up a Ministry that cannot. Let the Ministers be bound to no more than to read, and a few years will transform them to such as can do no more than read. *Baxters second Defence of the meer Nonconformists, page 15.*

I doubt not, but there are some pious Persons among you, I Censure not farther than Experience constraineth me. But I know that the Common Sense of most that are serious in practical Christianity, is against your formal wayes of Worship; and against the Course that you have taken in this Land. And the Spirit of Prophaness Complaceth with you, and doteth on you, in all places that ever I was acquainted in. Bear with plain Truth: It is in a Cause of Everlasting Consequence. There is somewhat in a gracious Soul, like Health in the Body, that disposeth it to Relish wholsom food, and perceive more difference between it, and meer Air, or toyish Kick-shaws, than it can easily express. *Baxters fifth Dispute of Church-Government Pref. page 17.*

Compare this with Mr. *Baxters* Answer to Dr. *Owens* twelve Arguments, Page 42.

And if it be the disuse of your Common-prayer, that you separate from us for, I would know of you, Whether you would have denyed Communion with all that lived before it had a Being? If this be your Religion, I may ask you, Where was your Religion before *Luther*, before *King Edwards* day? If you say in the *Mas-book*, (And what else can you say) I ask you then, where was it before the *Mas-book* had a Being? *Baxters fifth Dispute, &c. Pref. page 30.*

Could men have been content to have made Gods Laws the Centre, and Touch-stone of the Churches Unity, all had been well. But when they must make Cannons for this Vesture, and that Gesture, and the other Ceremony; and determine in what Words all men shall pray,  
and

and how many words he shall say, or how long he shall be; and so make standing Laws upon mutable Circumstances; and this without any Necessary at all, but only to Domineer, &c. Baxters fifth Dispute, page 9.

They [the Pharisees] used long Prayers, as a Cloak for their Oppression. Query, Whether they were a Lyturgy or not? If yea, so let it pass in their Character. If not, Then it is scarce like that there was any other Lyturgy than the Scripture in those times; else it is most likely that the Pharisees would have used it. Apology for Nonconformists, page 95.

But to set up a new sort of Jurisdiction in the Church, by Legislation to make Forms and Ceremonies Obligatory; and by Excommunications to punish Pastors that will not practice them is,

Lastly, By this means you will harden the Papists, that by their inventions and impositions have divided the Church, and been guilty of so much imposition and Tyranny. For, how can we condemn that in them that is practiced by our selves? And though in number of inventions they exceed; yet it is not well to concur with them in the kind of unnecessary Impositions, and so far to justify them in their injury to the Church.

If none of these or other reasons, will allay the imperious Distemper of the proud; but they must needs (by an usurped Legislation) be making indifferent things become necessary to others, and domineer over mens Consciences, and the Church of God: We must leave them to him, that being Lord and Lawgiver of the Church, is jealous of His Prerogative, and abhorreth IDOLS; and will not give His Glory to another, and that delighteth to pull down the proud, and humble them that Exalt themselves. Baxters 5th Dispute of Church-Government, page 378.

That to that very Question [Whether they know of any thing in the Lyturgy, with which they could not comply without Sin] we after gave in a Paper of eight particulars in the Lyturgy, which we undertook to prove flat sin. Apology for meer Nonconformists, page 155.

Moreover, the same reasons that prevail with us, will prevail with others when we are dead. They will be as fearful of Lying, and Perjury, and of swearing Allegiance to Church-Usurpers, as we have been. There will still be a People seriously Religious, that are Christians in good sadness, and really believe a Life to come. There is no hindering it; God will have it so, and who can gainsay Him? And these



men will be as loath in point of Order and Decency, to have Religion dwindled into a lifeless form of Words and Ceremonies; and to take the Chaff and straw for the Corn; as ever we have been before them: And the History of our Sufferings, will but animate them, *id. ibidem*, page 198.

These are not all I have to alledge of yours, of the same Colour. Whether you will count your Writings of *this Nature*, or those which *contradict* them for your *Disgrace*, I cannot tell. I am sure both cannot (if considered together) much raise the value of your *Authority* in this Controversy. And I think, if I had been minded to have vindicated all the twelve Arguments you brand as *so faulty*, I could have produced, to justify most of what you say is most unjustifiable, not only by your *Authority*, but your *Reasons* also, made ready to my hand: but that was not my undertaking in that Tract. If any doubt of my fidelity in these Citations, I give them the books, and pages, wherein they may find them to a Word. My Credit is impaired, if not forfeited; by a wilful or negligent Failure. But if it should be demanded, how Mr. Baxter's Judgment and Zeal could thus *vary and oppose* to such a Degree? I can give them no farther light than this; That these Cited Passages were Printed in the years 1659, 61, or 62, & 81. But that against the twelve Arguments in 84.

I am heartily averse to writing any thing in reply to you, that favours of wrangling; especially in Personal Concerns: But if you will necessitate me by such *Reflecting Queries*, to answer so as is displeasing to us both; I cannot help that. There is one behind, which I must not omit, which contains a Charge that (if true) renders me so great a fool, and to soul an Offender, as to be utterly unfit to be concerned in any thing that requires either Judgment, or Common Honesty: But if it be *false* (as indeed it is) I leave you, and the Reader to make the right Construction.

You say, Page 30. *If the work* [the Manuscript] *be faulty*, why do you not joyn with me to save men from it? and why did your private Letter own it his Conjunct with Fame? I offered you to stop it. Is it *disingenuity* in me, to tell you of twenty untruths in your Letter; and many notorious: [you say in your Printed answer to the unknown Author, they are Untruths in matter of Fact, which aggravates their Faultiness] and *ingenuity* in you to be offended for being told of them, rather than for writing them? This is to comply with the World

that taketh the Detector for the only Sinner.

To the first I say, *Fair and softly*. Let your own Act in opposing the Manuscript be first excus'd, or *excusable* (at least in my Opinion,) before I am perswaded to joyn with you in it. I may add, what needed this, if you believed the *Title* you give to the Book I now answer? or had not *forgot* it before you writ Page 30?

To the second, you lay to my charge things that I know not. You say it is, and of the Author of the Vindication. In your Postscript of your Answer to the 12 Arguments, he was to you the *unknown* Author, but in your Answer to my Vindication, you are so well, or so *well* informed of the Author of that so *sauely* Letter, that without any doubting you fix it on *me*. I gave you no reason for it, nor could any other. And that Opinion you express frequently of the Author of the Vindication, doth not well agree with the great imprudence you charge on the private Letter. But in short Sir, I assure (who have the best means to know it), that I wrote not that, nor any other Letter to you these many years last past; neither had I any knowledge of the Agitations you speak of. And should I have said in a Letter to you, that the Manuscript was the Doctors, & afterward in Print said I did not believe it, (as you print it) & have blamed you for imputing it to him; I had played a very disingenuous and inexcusable part; Trepan'd you into a Mistake, and then expos'd it. But as the Case stands, I shall only say, that your charging me therewith was but an *inexcusable Slander*, or the indifferent thing, (supposing the Letter as bad as you represent it) of laying the Punishment of one mans guilt, on the next that stood in your Way. Yet Sir, I believe, this was no *wilful* wrong done by you, but a Mistake for want of *due* Consideration. But this it is to be a *Nameless* Author; instead of *no* Name, to get a *bad* one.

SECT.

But if this be the thing you are going to say, you must suppose them to know what is done in the World as well as we. Now to make this possible, your other supposition is necessary, that

Some of the Saints in Heaven ought to be considered as the Spectators of our Actions, and that the whole Body of the Saints are to be considered as the Spectators of our Actions.

**Of Repentance in Heaven, and the Displeasure of Glorified Saints there, at their Mistakes defended on Earth, asserted by Mr. Baxter.**

SOMEWHAT, Reverend Sir, I must say to your third Section, page 15, but as little as the thing will bear, it being but *accidental* to the present business, though you spend eleven pages upon it, I had asserted, that if Dr. Owen were undoubtedly displeased with

*mistakes*, being defended by *any one on Earth*, now he is glorified Soul in Heaven, he must undoubtedly have the knowledge of such a Defence. And that affirming such a knowledge, would deprive us of our *best* Weapon against the Idolatry and Superstition of the Papists, in their invocation of Saints.

In Answer to this page, 16, (beside some sportive Passages) you extend the Knowledge of the Saints in Heaven, as far as to *Yniscence*, and rational Conclusions from *what is said* that supplies them with will go. And I think Sir, you have therein said, all that can be said with *Reason*, (as for what God immediately, or by Angels may reveal to them, is no ground to us, unless we understood it better.) but seeing you go no farther than *strong Possibilities*, as to the present instance, your *undoubtedly* is not without doubt, and I am safe enough yet.

But Sir, I think you venture too hard, to argue from those *Tropicks* of the Saints judging the World, and the Extension of a Sun-beam. The first may be done Congruently enough, by their accompanying Christ in that Action, and applauding his Justice in its Execution; which they may know to be *such*, by the ability and integrity of such a Judge; beside the Books of Evidence, that shall then be opened.

But if this be any thing to *your* purpose, you must suppose them to know all that is done in the World in all the *parts* of it. Now to make this *feasible*, your other *Notion* falls in as pat as can be. *Nor that they live as unconcerned Strangers to Earth, when a Sun-beam can reach so far, page 16.* You seem here to fancy that the Souls in Heaven ought *rationaly* to be concluded, to have a Prospect of *terrene* things; as *extensive*, and penetrating as the Sun-beams at least. But yet considering, that the dense Body of the Earth doth so interpose, that it must be beholding to its *Circular* motion, to visit with its *direct* beams all the inhabitants of this earthly Globe; that will not serve *your* turn, unless you fancy also their station and motion equally (at least) Correspondent. But by this, and what follows, you seem your self a little affected with the *Vertigo*. For, you provide *these*, with other Antidotes, *least I saign them to have News-books, Gazets, and Post-letters hence.*

But Sir, this Caution belongs rather to those, who will needs have them so exactly *knowing* of our Concerns here below; and you seem to be in some danger of it, since you have already begun the *Correspondence*, by a thing in the form of an Epistle from Dr. Owen in Heaven, in your Postscript to your Answer to the twelve Arguments.

Of much the same *humour*, is your sorrow and desperation of my change of my Opinion of the *uncertainty* of the Saints knowing what, and when we pray; [for so I expressed my Opinion] to be my best *Weapon* against the *Popish Superstition* of praying to Saints. Yet for all *this*, you will hope, that I do not pray to Dr. Owen for so much as I believe he *knoweth*.

*Ans:* No, nor to Mr. Baxter neither, if he were in Heaven, and as knowing as he. For, though I shall still retain this *Weapon* as our best, we have store of others good enough against that *Foppery*. I presume you will hold me excused for answering you in *your* kind: *Hanc veniam ----- petimusq; vicissim.*

That the Saints in Heaven have *displeasure*, which you affirm in Contradiction to me, I am now to consider. You begin very *warily*, page 16. and confine it to *Displacence*; the contrary to that *Complacence* which is in the *will*: saying, *As pleasedness and displeasedness are in the Passions, and signify joy and trouble, you have here nothing to do with them (having expressly excluded sorrow) but in the Will.* So that it seems we are agreed that there is no displeasure

as in the *Passions*, which is the same sence with the vulgar Word *Affections*: But here you first suppose that I must not imagine you should *Contradict* your self. For this, I crave you pardon ! 'tis more than possible.

To make *sure work*, you fetch your arm *about* and will prove that in God himself there is displeasure, ( which is the word you must allow, or you contradict not me ) and then the *Consequence* is undeniable, that glorified Souls are not less, but more capable of it. While you bring Scripture to prove this, who *dare* contradict it? and in this you are not sparing ; for you fill up your nineteenth page with Scripture Quotations, to *Convince* me that the Scripture saith God is *displeased*. A Child in his Psalter knows this ; your *Concordance* would ( without much pains-taking, ) have furnished you with five times as many.

But what earnings do you make of all these Scripture Quotations? Do any of them say that this displeasure is *Consen'd* to his *Will*, and hath nothing to do with *sorrow*, the *Affections* or *Passions*? Doth not the Scripture say, that God was *grieved*, pained at the very *Heart*, angry, yea, in *fury*? do not these express *displeasure* or displicence, as in the *Passions* ; contrary to joy and *Peace*? The Scripture also speaks of Gods Eyes, Arm, Hand ; you cannot make these *flourishes* of Scripture, but only to make a shew to the most ignorant: You know Sir, that 'tis not to be taken in *proprio sensu*. God speaks to *men*, therefore speaks after the manner of men ; make your inference now, and what will you get by it. God speaks of himself to *men* after the manner of *men* ; Ergo we may speak of men after the manner of *God*. To as much *purpose*, you tell us of all the forreign *Reformers*, and of *Hilderham*, *Dod*, *Greenham*, *Bolton*, *Rogers*, *Sibbs*, *Preston*, page 20. All these said God was displeased in the Scripture Sence ; not one of them ( that you prove ) said it in your sence : nor can you ( I believe ) produce one of them, that ever said that the Saints are displeased in *Heaven*.

As to these Expressions of Gods *Displeasure*, *Grief*, *Anger*, &c. they relate to the Acts of Gods Providence, which are *ad extra*, which in men are the Signs and Effects of such Affections or Passions: But it follows not, that they are indications of the same things in God ; which if they are in him, must be infinitely and essentially so.

As.

As for Schoolmens Disputes, and the Notions of Metaphysical Authors of this matter, if I were better acquainted with them than I am, I should not here concern my self much with them, who too often do *insanire cum ratione* about little things, much more about God whose Perfections are so above humane Comprehension. But to reduce this dispute to a narrow Compass; I agree with you, that as in the Divine Understanding all Sin is evil, and disapproved or disliked; so there is in the *Will* of God somewhat answerable to it; But by what *Name* to call it, I am not resolved by all the Conduct I have yet met with. Nor am I satisfied to call it *will*, which you make *univocal* ( or near it ) with *Displacere* as many of the School-men do; because it sounds too harshly, as if that might be, the being of which God doth *will*; and so Gods *Volition* or *Will* by Consequence be *Crossed* or *Contradicted*. And if you Construe your *displeased* in the Understanding, and that by *Nolition*, ( except as *Nolition* may be in the Understanding ) I can see no reason ( pardon my dulness ) to receive it.

And whereas you say, page 19. *The Hebrew Phrase which we translate by displeasing to God or man, is oft [ it was Evil in his Eyes ] which speaketh a Positive Act of the Understanding de malo: And that there was no answerable Act of the Will, let him say that dares: I am not so daring as to say by what name it must, or may be called; yet seeing I have said in the Book, and place you here oppose, tho' in Heaven there is dislike and dis-approbation; (which you your self agree to be much of your sense of displeasure); you might have abated very many of your Reflections. And I now say, that God *will*ing the Punishments of Sin, is an Act of his *Will*; and the Punishments Executed the *Effects* of that *will*ing, or Act of his Will. And I hope you will not deny, but this is very answerable to the Act of Gods Understanding *de malo*; and I may be excused saying more as to the Act of Gods will *de malo*. Thus far we shall not much fall out.*

All your discourse here of displeasure in God, hath been to make way for this *Consequence*, that a glorified Soul in Heaven may be *displeased*, *exempli gratia*, Dr. Owen's. But what if it appear, that you have *mistaken*, yet expressly *excluded* the Question (you ought to have put) *hitherto*? And you your self, *mistook* in your Expression, and not I in my Exposition? I think this will appear by your Comparative. You say, I doubt not but by defending it, [ the Doctors Mistake ] you far more *displease* him than me.

Here



Here is only term without *Explication*, by which the Apprehensions of an evil by Dr. Owen in Heaven, and Mr. Baxter on Earth, is expressed; and that is [*displeased*] and all the difference of this displeasedness expressed, is but *Secundum magis & minus*, Dr. Owen more displeased than Mr. Baxter; but the displeasure is of the same *idemical Species*, (excepting sorrow) but if sorrow be excepted, all the rest that is included in the Displeasure is *Confirmed*; *Exceptio firmat do non exceptis*. And that includes (as it is or may be in Mr. Baxter at the said mistake) Anger, Wrath, Bitterness, Perturbation; and if you can excuse your self totally of *Sinful Hatred* of the Persons that displease you, it is more than many a very good man can do in the like Case. None of these are excepted by excluding *Sorrow*: yea such is the *Viciousness* of corrupt Nature, that the best of men do (while prevailed on by these Passions) take too much pleasure in them. I hope now you will not say, that the Saints in Heaven may be affected with such displeasure.

If you will needs speak Mysteries, in a case where no such things are necessary, or to the Purpose; and limit your sence of your Expressions no better, you may excuse your Readers mistaking you, while they construe your meaning by your words, which you seem to frame with exact Consideration.

And now Sir, give me leave to look back on that very harsh Conclusion, you make by all the links (good or bad) of the Chain of your Consequences, from my saying, that the Saints have no displeasure in Heaven, in Contradiction to Mr. Baxter: for that is all that is mine, the rest is your own, and you must answer for them. I look (say you, page 22.) to hear ere long from Prefs and Pulpits, that the Nonconformists teach, that no Rebellion, Treason, Perjury, or Wickedness, is at all displeasing to God, to Christ, to Angels, or to any Saint in Heaven. Though they call Adulterers, Murderers; and such others to Repentance, and mourning for Sin; and separate from others as too bad for their Communion. Indeed at the same time, they tell all the Wicked, neither God, nor any in Heaven is displeased with them.

Do you indeed look for this! I am verily perswaded not any of the most angry Adversaries of the Nonconformists, with all their Wit, would from this Passage have thought of such a horrible Charge, as having the least shadow of rational dependance there-  
on



on. But now you have *taught* it them, and they have Mr. Baxter's Authority to do that, which I believe they will be ashamed to do notwithstanding. O Sir, to what Extremities, and beyond Extremities, do you run things! I believe in this fit of *Displeasure* you had little *Sorrow*. What will become of the *Saints Rest*, if such Displeasure be found amongst the Saints in Heaven? Doth this speak you to be a meet man to Reconcile, make peace, and heal the Churches Wounds; who know not how to *breathe* in a *Controversy*, but it must come to a *Hurricane*? The Lord be merciful to his Church, & every part of it, & deliver them from such Products of impatience of Contradiction, & from so *over-valuing* any Person, as to dote on his Conduct, without *trying*, and especially Considering what *Spirit* he is of.

You seem to heal *all again* in the next Paragraph, by mollifying my Error (as you call it) as merely *Verbal*. Thus you blast, overthrow, wound, arm Adversaries with venomous Weapons; add to the griefs of the already afflicted; and then cure all in a Trice, with a breath: as if these things were at your beck, and must move exactly to the Tune of your present fancies or *Passions*.

I shall now consider, what you say of *Repentance* in Heaven. You begin thus: *My third supposed Error is much like the former; saying, that though Heaven have no Sorrow, it hath great Repentance: In this all Protestants are falsely said to be against me.*

*Ans.* You have in these words a double *Mistake* in matter of *Fact*. I neither said it was an *Error*, nor that I supposed it to be an Error. (though it may be such notwithstanding) Nor did I say, that in this all Protestants are against you. So that what you make the ground of this part of the Controversy, is *all* Mistake. Yet you go on, and tell your Reader that I am puzzled at it as a *dangerous* Doctrine: though your *next* line *acknowledges*, that I attempt not in one Syllable to blame any thing but the *Word*. And had I not reason for so doing, and to say as I did, that it doth and will sound very *offensively*; & most by far, will either not understand you, or *misunderstand* you? Do you think that School Subtilties, and those Reconciling Notions which you are so stored with, are the Talents of most that may happen to read your Book? And that they can tell what to make of Repentance in Heaven & without *Sorrow*? you have said somewhat to inform or *exercise* their intellects in this, but not one Word in *that* Book.

And

And now Sir, I take my self to be as little obliged to Answer, or Consider what you say farther, ( as *Contradicting* any thing said by me ) as you had to write it ; and that is none at all. But because ( much like the former ) you contrive from these mistakes of your own, a very black ( I had almost said a *Malevolent* ) Conclusion ; I shall observe how you fetch it about. Your Conclusion is this, page 25. *I doubt not but those aforesaid, [ Vide page 22. ] that are disposed to Obloquy, will take occasion from your Words, ( yea the Papists from your intituling all Protestants to it ) to say the Nonconformists ( or the Protestants ) hold that Murder, Rebellion, Persecution, and all Sin is so small a matter to their Saints in Heaven, that they do not so much as repent of it, or will, or wish they had never done it : therefore, they either justify it, or are Neuters to it.*

Do you think the men you speak of have such a high Opinion of your Logical *Concluding* Faculty, as to charge men with holding all that you say are the *Consequences* of their Opinion ? They are wiser than so for their own sakes. Or may they not as well conclude much of the like nature, from our ( or your ) Saints in Heaven, not being sorry for any of these Crimes ? You said you lookt for such Reflections, page 22. here you *doubt not* of them. But pardon me if I say, that I expect the men you speak of are masters of so much Reason, Truth and Candor, that they will rather say, That in these Conclusions, Mr. *Baxter* consulted not the Premises nor himself.

Now Sir, I shall Consider how you came by your *dismal* Conclusions, ( supposing I had charged you with *Error* in that Expression ; and had also said, that herein all Protestants are against you ; both which you said of me untruly ) And I fear, that your hammering to mend one hole, hath made more than two ; the usual issue of *over-doing*.

First, you tell me of *Gods* being said to *repent* in Scripture. Now least I should not believe it, or take one Scripture Authority for no sufficient Conviction ; you direct me by Quotations to fifteen. I thank you for this great Charity and necessary pains. But what is all this to the Purpose ? Dare you say that *proprie dictum* God repents, or deny that spoken of him it is a denomination from the Changes he makes *ad extra* ; as the Effects of his eternal and *immutable* Will, without any change in himself ? You tell me at next word, that 'tis not spoken of God, as if he had any Mutability as man hath. And yet you add, as mighty unwilling to acknowledge your Scripture instances *impertinent* here : *But God being infinitely more*

perfect, the Phrase is farther fetched, and less proper of God than of man: Therefore it is not the name that he blameth, seeing he owneth the word of God.

Reverend Sir, I observe you go here *all* by Comparatives: *Mutability as man hath; infinitely more perfect than man, further fetch'd: All which I should have taken no notice of; but because of the following words, that the phrase of God repenting, is less proper of God than of Man.* This plainly renders it your opinion, that Repentance is proper to God (as contradicting it from figurative) though in a less degree, and *farther fetcht*, than when spoken of man: which opinion whether it be not *utterly* untrue, and unspeakably dangerous, I refer to the Judicious Reader. I would you had told us how much less proper, and how much *farther fetcht*, when spoken of God. To what you conclude, *It is not therefore the name, &c.* I say I blame not the word repentance 'tis true; but your (at least) indiscreet, if not impertinent use and misapplication of it.

You acknowledg, that *I* had prevented your labour in transcribing other Authors, that use *μετανοέω* and *μεταμέλειμαι* usually for a meer change of the mind, purpose and practice, without any signification of sorrow. And *I* also told you, that if you had said the Saints in heaven were grown wiser, had a better understanding, and did disapprove of what they in this life thought good and true; This might (if nothing else) have stopped your torrent of dismal consequences, for they who do so, are far from justifying or being Neuters as (you express it) as to Murder, Rebellion, Persecution and all sin as a small matter, &c.

But yet you say page 23. *But let us willingly take the Scripture use, which speaketh of Repentance in heaven, and on Earth.* *Ans.* We have nothing to do in this Controversy, with repentance of any on earth: but of the Saints in heaven. And you tell us at the bottom of the same page, that *we find no talk in Scripture of any in heaven repenting but God.* Can I wish a fairer adversary? That shall more willingly and expressly yield the Cause? But by the next Paragraph you *repent* all this again, and say; *All those acts of Repentance Souls have in heaven: which rise to the number of five.* So that you can talk of what Souls do in Heaven, that by your own *confession* within five lines before, the Scripture is utterly silent in. Have you any Revelation peculiar to your self of those things?

*I* must also Reverend Sir, enter my dissent to some other passages upon the subject of Repentance in this life, to which you are pleased

fed to direct me page 24. in that you say, *But usually we have cause of sorrow, as well as of Repentance; and must joyn them together: But where the Gospel frequently promiseth Repentance, Pardon and Life together; and Preacheth both Repenting and Believing in order to present joy; there is little mention of sorrow in the Converts, save for the murdering of Christ, & some great sin.* Answ. Is this a safe limitation to say usually, which excludes sorrow from our Repentance even in this life very often, if not mostly, is no duty? Your after-instances restrain it to the murdering of Christ, or some great sin. Then it seems we ought to repent, (That is, *Change our mind and will, and wish we had not done what we did* (which you call the prime and common sence of Repentance within a few lines) of all sin; but be sorry (in repenting) only for some great sin. But how great you tell us not, except the murdering of Christ must be taken for its measure.

Yet here you argue from the negative, *a non dicto ad non factum*. There might be great sorrow, where we have it not expressed; and where we find the Gospel Preached, affecting with present joy, there might be room enough for sorrow afterward.

But you go on to fortifie this notion from 2 Cor. 7. 9. & 10. *I rejoyce not that ye were made sorry, but that ye sorrowed to Repentance; for godly sorrow worketh Repentance to Salvation, not to be repented of; You then demand, Is the sence godly sorrow worketh, godly sorrow? I answer no: and yet you are never the nearer your end; for one part of Repentance may very well contribute to another. And this other part, Emendation, being the more excellent part, may very well take the denomination of the whole. Conviction is not Conversion, yet Conversion includes Conviction; not only as an inseparable adjunct, but also as an essential part. And if it should be said, Conviction worketh Conversion to life; this would not conclude, that Conversion doth not include Conviction. This is spoken of Repentance in this life, to which you have led me by going out of the way.*

But to tell you my thoughts of Repentance of Souls in heaven, I am of opinion, that there is none there: I take Repentance, and so do you, to consist in its primary principal parts, in the change of the Understanding and Will; and this differs so little from the sence of the word Conversion, as is hardly if at all distinguishable. It may be said of the Saints in heaven, that they are Converted, but not that there is any Conversion there: The like of Repentance. Because the acts of Conversion and Repentance are *in via*, and may properly

be called the *transitus* or passage of the Soul, from all the corruptions of nature, to *Consummate* grace, which is not attained in *this* life. But when Grace is *Consummate*; the work of Repentance and Conversion is over, because there is no more sin to Convert or *Repent from*. And you allow all that is urged, to fortifie this sence; in your saying p. 24. to prove, that sorrow for sin is not alway a necessary adjunct of Repentance, Heb. 6 & 1. *It is not called Repentance for dead works, but from dead works*; if this will serve your turn, to shut out sorrow from Repentance here, it will serve mine much more to shut Repentance out of heaven; for there can be no repenting from dead works, so as to make any change after they are lodged in that perfect state, and have no dead works to repent from.

I conclude with a few passages of *your* own, which makes you seem so *generous*, as to give freely; though you will hardly yield to have the same things *forced* from you. But we find no talk in Scripture of any in heaven repenting but God: No wonder; how little hath God told us of the particular state and action of separated Souls, before the Resurrection; When it pleaseth God so sparingly to mention their present state, (yea, and their Immortality in the Old Testament) shall we feign that he must tell us of all their thoughts? Page 25. But your last and best words on this argument are, *I only hence conclude, that we must not take on us to know more than we do of separate Souls, nor to make a measure, or manner of blessedness for them of our own heads, nor to apply every Text to them that is spoken of the state after the Resurrection.* There is enough besides to feast our joyful hopes. ANSW.

Cur in Theatrum Cato severe yenisti?  
An ideo tantum veneras ut exires?

You seem to have faln out, that we might shake hands at Reconciliation. You have here (if we may take your sence by your words) repented of your *undoubted* repentance and displeasure to the Saints in heaven; for to say there is such things there, is to feign to our selves, and of our own heads; for of these the Scripture no where speaks. I thought we should meet at Hedge or Style. It's better parting in fair Weather then in a Storm. And therefore

F I N I S.

*Cur in Theatrum*

